REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 25-31 are allowed.

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully notes that it appears that there is a typographical error in the rejection portion as it refers to claim "22". However, Applicant will interpret this as a typographical error since another portion of the rejection refers to claim 33. Applicant respectfully traverses because a transformation occurs, such as a change in instruction sequence due to the adding of a no-op. Nonetheless, Applicant has amended claim 33 to expedite prosecution and as such, respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,357,617 (Davis). The Davis reference is directed to a method and apparatus for concurrent multiple instruction thread processing by a single pipeline processor. As noted in the rejection, the Davis programmable processor includes a three stage processor namely a fetch stage, a decode stage and a single "execution stage". However, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim requires, among other things, an execution pipeline having "a depth of a plurality of execution stages and a depth less than or equal to the plurality of programs". As claimed, the execution pipeline does not include a single execution stage but instead the claim requires a plurality of execution stages and a depth as claimed. (See for example, page 13 of the Specification). In contrast, Davis merely utilizes a single execution stage pipeline. Since Davis does not teach the claimed subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

9

Claims 3, 5, 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,710 (Eickemeyer). Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim and are also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis in view of Nguyen. Applicant respectfully submits that this dependent claim is allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim and is also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis in view of Narayanaswami. Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim and are also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claims 14, 16, 17 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis in view of Krishna. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1 and as such, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis and Krishna in view of Eickemeyer. Applicant respectfully submits that this dependent claim is allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim and is also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis and Krishna in view of Nguyen. Applicant respectfully submits that this dependent claim

10

is allowable at least as depending from an allowable base claim and is also believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Joffe in view of Krishna. Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the "Response to Arguments" and respectfully submits that the Joffe reference does not appear to teach what is alleged. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions, namely col. 2, lns. 29-39 and col. 10, lns. 19-32 do not describe checking to see if all of the programs are completed. To the contrary, the cited portions simply state that when an instruction is suspended, it is re-executed. This is done for a single task. Applicant is unable to find in the cited portions any indication that Joffe looks to see if all of the plurality of programs are completed. It appears that Joffe merely describes in the cited portions that when a wait signal is asserted and removed or a suspend operation is present, a pending instruction is re-executed. Since the reference does not teach what is alleged, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 22, 2009

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.
222 North LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois 60601
312/609-7500
312/609-5005 Facsimile